UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,772	12/30/2003	Vladimir Savchenko	6570P068	1051

8791 7590 06/08/2009

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER	
HIGA, BRENDAN Y	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,772	SAVCHENKO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRENDAN Y. HIGA	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-28 and 30-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *11 and 29* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 02, 2009 has been entered.

Claims 1-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As is known in the art the term "computer accessible medium" [which was not defined by the applicant's specification - page 58, ¶00126, defines "system-readable medium" as opposed to "computer accessible medium"] encompasses both storage mediums and transport mediums, such as carrier wave signal mediums (see "*The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms*" 7th ed. 2000, which defines a 'media' (computer) as *"material on which information can be stored or transported"* also see 'medium' *"the material on which the data may be transmitted"*; also see 'machine-readable' *"pertaining to medium that can record*

information and convey it to a machine together"; also see 'signal' *"the intelligence, message or effect to be conveyed over a communication system"*), thus without the specification excluding such mediums as transport type signal mediums, the invention does not fall within a statutory category under 35 U.S.C. 101, since signals per se are not recognized as a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter required for patentability (See *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2007)).

In order to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection the examiner recommends amending the claim to read on "a system readable storage medium" (supported in applicant's specification on page 58 ¶00126).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 10, 12-15, 18-22, 25, 28, 30-33 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma").

As per claim 1, Sharma teaches:

Accessing a first logical port ("logical service reference", see ¶0118) defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "*Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service*", read as accessing a logical port defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface), the first logical port comprising an abstraction of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *wherein the logical service reference (i.e. the first logical port comprising an abstraction…) links to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service (i.e. service endpoint 555) read as an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface)*

Selecting an item of configuration in the accessed first logical port (see ¶0118, *"endpoint address for service endpoint 555, properties specific to a protocol 535 and underlying transport 540 that may be used by client 510 to communicate with server 530, security information, and type mapping registry information"* read as items of configuration of the service endpoint interface) to configure access to one or more operations of the service endpoint interface via the first logical port (see ¶0018, *"Deployer 137 may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies",* which implies access to one or more operations of the service endpoint interface via the first logical port (i.e. "logical service reference", see ¶0118)), the item of configuration information to set one or more of an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and protocol configuration (see ¶0118, "properties specific to a protocol 535", read as protocol configuration); and

providing a value for the selected item of configuration information to define, at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *"Deployer may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies",* also see ¶0113 wherein the proxy represents a service endpoint interface, i.e. Fig. 5, ref. 555).

As per claim 2, Sharma further teaches providing a HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) proxy address for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118 "the configuration information may include the endpoint address for service endpoints" and ¶0087 wherein Sharma provides an example of endpoint address as "http://example.com/stockquite", read as an HTTP proxy address)

As per claim 3, Sharma further teaches providing an access address for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "*endpoint address for service endpoint 555", read as a access address)*.

As per claim 4, Sharma further teach providing the access address being a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118 and ¶0087 wherein Sharma provides an example of endpoint address as "http://example.com/stockquite", read as a URL).

As per claim 10, Sharma further teaches specifying a name for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118 and ¶0087 wherein Sharma provides an example of endpoint address as "http://example.com/stockquite", read as a [URL] name for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface).

As per claim 12, Sharma teaches:

A Web service client (see Fig. 5, ref. 510, ¶0111) having a service endpoint interface to expose a Web service method to a client application *(see ¶0112-¶0013, "Once the WSDL document 550 corresponding to the target service is located, the document may be imported by client 510"..."Once imported the WSDL document may be processed by a WSDL-to-Java mapping tool executing in client 130 that generates", inter alia, "a service endpoint interface", read as a web service client having a service endpoint interface for exposing a web service to a client application)*; and

a processor and logic executable thereon to access a first logical port ("logical service reference", see ¶0118) defining a first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "*Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service*", read as a deployer 137 providing a logical port defining a service interface), the first logical port comprising an abstraction of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *wherein the logical service reference (i.e. the first logical port comprising an abstraction...) links to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding*

service (i.e. service endpoint 555) read as an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface),

provide configuration information based on one or more of an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and protocol configuration (see ¶0118, "properties specific to a protocol 535", read as protocol configuration) for the accessed first logical port to define, at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *"Deployer may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies"*); and

provide access to one or more operations of the service endpoint interface via the first logical port (see ¶0018, *"Deployer 137 may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies"*, which implies access to one or more operations of the service endpoint interface via the first logical port (i.e. "logical service reference", see ¶0118)),

As per claim 19, Sharma teaches:

A service endpoint interface to expose a Web service method to a client application *(see ¶0112-¶0013, "Once the WSDL document 550 corresponding to the target service is located, the document may be imported by client 510"..."Once imported the WSDL document may be processed by a WSDL-to-Java mapping tool executing in client 130 that generates", inter alia, "a service endpoint interface", read as a web service client having a service endpoint interface for exposing a web service to a client application)*; and

A logical port ("logical service reference", see ¶0118) implemented between the client application and the service endpoint interface to define a first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "*Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service*", read as a deployer 137 providing a logical port defining a service interface between a client application and the service endpoint interface), the first logical port comprising an abstraction of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *wherein the logical service reference (i.e. the first logical port comprising an abstraction…) links to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service (i.e. service endpoint 555) read as an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface),* Wherein the logical port to provide one or more of an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and protocol configuration to set the first configuration (see ¶0118, "properties specific to a protocol 535", read as protocol configuration).

As per claim 28, Sharma further teaches wherein the Web service method is based, at least in part, on a Web Service Description Language (WSDL) PortType as specified in a WSDL document describing the Web service method (see ¶0069).

Claims 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 38 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-4, 10, 12, 19 and 28 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 16, 23, 24, 34 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma") in view of Omoigui (US 2003/0126136) ("Omoigui").

As per claim 5, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information" see ¶0118, however Sharma does not expressly teach specifying an authentication type for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

Nevertheless, authentication type information is typically used in the computer networking art for security purposes. For example, in the same art of web services, Omoigui teaches a system that employs various authentication schemes for providing access to web services, including client certificates over SSL (see ¶0370).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Omoigui for configuring authentication schemes such as client certificates over SSL for accessing web services. The motivation for doing so

would have been to prevent the accessing of web services by unauthorized clients in Sharma's invention.

As per claim 6, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information" see ¶0118, however Sharma does not expressly teach the use of client certificates for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

Nevertheless in the same art as noted above Omoigui teaches a system that employs various authentication schemes for providing access to web services, including client certificates over SSL (see ¶0370).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Omoigui for configuring authentication schemes such as client certificates over SSL for accessing web services. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the accessing of web services by unauthorized clients in Sharma's invention.

Claims 16, 23, 24, 34 and 40 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 5 and 6 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claims 7, 17, 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma") in view of Beringer et al. (US 2004/0172555) ("Beringer").

As per claim 7, Sharma does not teach the specific properties specifying a transport guarantee for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

However, in the same art of web service configuring, Beringer teaches a system for defining security information for web services. Specifically, Beringer teaches defining security features, including a confidentiality element for a message transmitted to a service provider for securing the message (see abstract and Fig. 4, ref. 46). (read as a transport guarantee feature consistent with the applicant's specification, see page 46 ¶0097 "*In an embodiment, Web service definition 2600 may specify transport guarantee features. For example, Web service definition 2600 may define whether or not data integrity and/or data confidentiality are to be supported for the associated virtual interface*").

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Beringer for defining a transport guarantee feature of the service endpoint interface. The motivation for doing so would have been for securing the web service messages within the teachings of Sharma.

Claims 17, 35 and 39 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claims 8, 9, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma") in view of Brown et al. (US 2004/0199636) ("Brown").

As per claim 8, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information", see ¶0118. However, Sharma does not expressly teach the security information including an encryption type for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

Nevertheless, encryption type information is typically used in the computer networking art for security purposes. For example, in the same art of web services, Brown teaches the use of an encryption type, such as the secure socket layer (SSL), for accessing web services (see ¶0043).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Brown for configuring an encryption type for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a secure connection for accessing web services in Sharma's invention.

As per claim 9, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information", see ¶0118. However, Sharma does not expressly teach the specified encryption type is a Secure Socket Layer protocol based encryption type. Nevertheless, in the same art as noted above, Brown teaches the use of an encryption type, such as the secure socket layer (SSL), for accessing web services (see ¶0043).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Brown for configuring an encryption type, such as the SSL protocol, for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a secure connection for accessing web services in Sharma's invention.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 8 and 9 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art does not teach nor render obvious *"accessing a second logical port defining a second*

configuration of the service endpoint interface; selecting an item of configuration information in the accessed second logical port; and providing a value for the selected item of configuration information to define, at least in part, the second configuration of the service endpoint interface", similarly, with respect to claim 29, the prior art does not teach nor render obvious *"a second logical port implemented between the client application and the service endpoint interface to define a second configuration of the service endpoint interface".*

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 26, 2008 have been fully considered but they not persuasive.

As per applicant's argument *"Applicants teach in the specification… a logical port… comprising an abstraction of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface. Such an abstraction is beneficial as it may allow the service endpoint interface to be configured via the logical port created, and may allow multiple different configurations for the same service endpoint interface via multiple logical ports, each having their own configuration, despite an underlying configuration which ordinarily constrains the configuration to a single specified configuration."* It is noted however, that claim 1, does not require *"a logical port to allow multiple different configurations from the same service endpoint interface via multiple logical ports, each having their own configuration"* but rather, claim 1 requires only a logical port to support a first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see *"accessing a first logical port*

defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface" also see *"providing a value for the selected item of configuration information to define; at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface"*). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, although the applicant alleges that the specification provides distinctions between the claimed logical port and the prior art "logical service reference", see ¶0018 (read as an abstract (i.e. software) interface), such distinctions, such as, see page 2 of applicant's remarks, *"For example, logical port 720 may be created by default and may copy the features from the underlying port (e.g. port 750) and binding (e.g., binding 754)"* are not reflected in the claims.

Similarly, as per applicant's argument *"Sharma does not contemplate or address the need for different configurations based upon a single "specified" configuration, and indeed, it would be impossible for Sharma to provide such a mechanism without more, such as the "logical port…comprising an abstraction of an underlying port"* (see applicant's remarks page on 14). It is noted that such a feature is not required by claim 1. For instance, claim 1 does not recite the logical port (i.e. *"the logical port comprising an abstraction of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface"*) being configured to support multiple configurations, but rather, the claim only requires the logical port to support a first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see *"accessing a first logical port defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface"* also see *"providing a value for the selected item of configuration information*

to define; at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface").

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see PTO 892).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRENDAN Y. HIGA whose telephone number is (571)272-5823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brendan Y Higa/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457